

BACONIANA.

VOL. XII. *Third Series.* JULY, 1914. No. 47.

WILLIAM SHAKSPERE OF STRATFORD.

IN an article which appeared in the November number of *The Nineteenth Century Review* I did my best towards re-directing Baconian research into normal ways of investigating questions of literary authorship, and showed or attempted to show that certain utterances of Ben Jonson were oracular, in the sense that they were intended to be read two ways. The chief business of the present article is to exhibit the Shakspeare tradition as it appears to a Baconian. A business of inferior interest is to answer a dozen or so of colourable objections which appeared in the December number of *The Nineteenth Century* above the signature of Sir Edward Sullivan.

1. Sir Edward says it is a libel on Ben Jonson to represent him as taking part in a literary juggle with intent to uphold the secret of Bacon's authorship. Jonson's motives for undertaking the part were *ex hypothesi* perfectly pure. Where then is the libel? Posterity has no indefeasible unconditional right to know the true name of any author, great or small. Sir Walter Scott must have taken this view when he denied—so we learn from his Letters edited by Horace Hutchin-

son, 1904—without a blush, that he had any hand in the writing of the *Waverley Novels*. Scott told a lie. Jonson equivocated. Jonson's motives were loyalty to and sympathy with fallen greatness. Scott's motives, whatever they may have been, cannot have been altruistic. If Scott's lie were justifiable, as my opponent will probably allow, Jonson's equivocation was positively laudable.

2. Sir Edward scorns the notion that Bacon chose for his "*alter ego* in composition," an unlettered actor. The notion is a bogey of Sir Edward's own making, with a view possibly to rhetorical effect. The only *alter ego* my article suggested was Sir Tobie Mathews, and that suggestion had nothing to do with "composition." The particular service that we Baconians think Shakspeare may have rendered to Bacon would require scarcely any qualification beyond loyalty to employers, and this qualification he probably had, or the Burbages (for instance) would hardly have called him a "deserving" man, as they did in 1635.

3. My opponent believes he has found a "singular inconsistency" in my reluctance to subscribe towards the search for ciphers, mystic numbers, and so forth. I was a Baconian before cipher-hunting began, and have consistently held aloof from anything of the kind.

4. Sir Edward, in dealing with my attempt to harmonize the ambiguities of the Ode to Shakespeare, accuses me of "here and there docking a sentence of its ending, asking an unsuspecting reader to take its meaning from the mutilated fragments in which I am careful to present it," and so on. Before waxing indignant on the "unsuspecting reader's" behalf, he should have cast his eye over the last two pages of my article. There he would have found that I had anticipated his accusation by giving the Ode *in full*.

5. Sir Edward pronounces that "there is really no evidence of anything unusual in connection with the production" of the *Prince's Masque*. An eminent critic—I think Malone—speaks of its "unusual splendour," and as the heir to the throne was both its sponsor and the leader of its stately dances, there is good reason to believe that it really was an extremely magnificent entertainment. Sir Edward says that *Neptune's Triumph* was staged in a much more costly and gorgeous manner. This statement needs proof, the more so as I seem to remember having read that *Neptune's Triumph*, though prepared, was never performed at all. Sir Edward also says that the *Prince's Masque* is "one of the poorest of all" Jonson's works of the kind. This also is a hard saying, and some of us might like to know whether it is backed by any other *arbiter elegantiarum*.

6. Sir Edward's mention of the relation between Bacon and Jonson induces me to repeat opinions expressed in a forgotten *Essay* of mine, viz., that the relation in question had once been anything but cordial, and that the change on Jonson's part occurred somewhere between his return from Scotland and Bacon's 60th birthday, which Jonson celebrated in the well-known lines addressed to the Genius of York House, Bacon's then London residence :

"Hail, happy Genius of the ancient pile.
How comes it all things so about thee smile?
The fire, the wine, the men! and in the midst
Thou stand'st as if some *mystery* thou didst,
Pardon, I read it in thy face, the day
For whose return, and many, all these pray;
And so do I."

The italicised words are mine, and I still imagine them to refer, the one to Bacon's secret intimacy with Poetry, his resolve to withhold his name from "her family," the other ("pardon") to Jonson's unfriendly criticism of the Bacon of an earlier age.

7. Sir Edward says truly enough that the First Folio is carelessly printed, abounds in mistakes, etc. The conditions were probably very unfavourable to accuracy—many hands and no supreme co-ordinator. Jonson, though *ex hypothesi* the nominal editor-in-chief in virtue of his Ode and other prefatorial matter, would not be likely to bestow upon a mass of work which the true author was bent on disowning, a tithe of the care and attention that he had devoted to the 1616 edition of his own *Works*.

8. Sir Edward seems to think that the sparing use by Bacon of verbal forms obviously characteristic of Shakespeare is a very strong point in his favour. But as one of the elements of our theory is that Bacon desired to escape identification with Shakespeare, his avoidance of such forms needs no explanation at our hands.

9. My opponent, having asserted that "most readers of Bacon would, I should say, describe him now as the master of only one style," takes me to task for having said that Bacon was a "master of many literary styles." Dr. Abbott, perhaps the highest living authority on Bacon, says of him that he "wrote magnificent prose in almost every conceivable style." Osborn, in *Advice to a Son* (1673) says that he had heard Bacon "entertain a country lord in the proper terms relating to hawks and hounds, and at another time out-cant a London surgeon." These quotations are enough to suggest that Bacon's style must have been Protean. As for Sir Edward's "most readers," I wonder how many, if any, genuine students of Bacon will be found in that crowd.

10. Another of Sir Edward's objections is founded on Bacon's acknowledged *Essay Of Love*. On the impossibility of reconciling that *Essay* with, for example, *Romeo and Juliet*, my opponent and I may agree. But

if that impossibility be conclusive against Bacon's authorship of the play, it is equally conclusive against his authorship of an unacknowledged Speech of his, *The Praise of Love*. Here are a few extracts from this Speech, an early manuscript of which, after having had a narrow escape from destruction by fire ages ago, was accidentally discovered some years after Spedding had published his fourteen volumes of *Lord Bacon's Works*. Love, we gather from this Speech, "is the happiest state of the minde; the noblest affection"; makes the "mynde heroicall"; is not a relative good, but "a true good . . . sweetneth the harshness of all deformities; . . . when two soules are joyned in one . . . no force can depress . . . being indeed, if not the hiest, yett the sweetest affection of all others. . . . Who denieth but the eye is first contented in love? . . . Lett us (therefore) make our suit to love that gathereth the beames of so many pleasures," etc. Reconciliation of this Speech with the *Essay Of Love*, as of the *Essay Of Love* with the Play of *Romeo and Juliet*, may well be impossible. Explanation, however, is ready to hand, and is the same for the Speech and Essay as for the Essay and Play. Both the Speech and the Play were written in youth and meant to delight, whilst the *Essay Of Love* was written in age, with an unromantic eye to business. One of the harshest sayings in the Essay, "The stage is more beholding to *Love* than the life of man," was probably written after Bacon had turned sixty, and some other very harsh sayings at the close of the Essay belong to about the same date (1625).

II. Sir Edward says that Prof. Dowden (whose deliberate opinions on Shakespeare should always be treated with respect) "summed up his views" on sceptics like myself in these words: "They have selected the one impossible man of the whole period as

the author." The words, we are told, were spoken in Sir Edward's presence. What is their value? To impartial judges they will suggest that Dowden, having caught sight of an effective paradox, must have fired it off without any reflection at all. Spedding held that Bacon had "the 'fine phrensy' of the poet," and thought "it would have carried him to a place among the great poets," had it not been his—Bacon's—life-long "study to refrain his imagination." A more accurate account of the matter would be that Bacon's "fine phrensy" was not refrained until long after it had carried him to a very high place among great poets. Shelley, it may be added, discerned that Bacon "was a poet."

In hands so unskilful as mine, this jerky, discontinuous method of controversy soon becomes irksome. Perhaps the following biographical sketch will prove less fatiguing.

Sixty years ago—before the days of Halliwell Phillipps and the New Shakspeare Society—it must have been easy to accept the tradition that William Shakspeare of Stratford was the supreme poet whom England is proud to claim as her son. Nowadays it is common knowledge that this William's home education was of the meagerest. School education of a sort he may have enjoyed, on the assumption—for which there is no evidence—that his ignorant parents thought it worth while to pay the school fees. It is extremely unlikely that clever boys abounded at Stratford, and any schoolmaster worth his salt would have kept his eye on a scholar of unusual promise, yet no schoolmaster has put on record any fact about the boy William. His schooling, if any, must have been cut very short, for a tradition, quite in keeping with all that we know of the lad, informs us that he was apprenticed to a butcher, an occupation which in those days probably required no schooling at all. The next credible tradition about him

is that he fell into bad company, and got mixed up in poaching raids. The story says nothing against his intelligence. But a butcher's boy who made so unprofitable use of his leisure was not likely to develop before 1593* into a poet who, in his "idle hours," wrote *Venus and Adonis*, an elaborate poetical exercise, elegant, facile, rhetorical, suggesting an author brought up on the Classics and at the time of writing obviously under the spell of Ovid. In this connection it may be well to mention that a year or two before 1593 (when *Venus and Adonis* made its public appearance) another rhetorical exercise on the same theme was being written by Francis Bacon.

In the eighties of the sixteenth century Shakspeare left Stratford, possibly because the neighbourhood had become too hot for him. Arrived in London, his first job, so we are informed, was to hold the horses of well-to-do frequenters of a theatre. In the course of time he found his way into the inside of the building, and ultimately became an actor not "over-parted" by roles such as the Ghost in *Hamlet*. But of his goings and comings, his sayings and doings in London, we know so little that we might suppose him to have donned the helmet of invisibility. After twenty or twenty-five years residence there, he may be said to emerge into view, no longer poor it is true, but mentally the very same person as before—to judge from the way in which the remainder of his life seems to have been spent. A hundred and fifty years later Samuel Johnson said to Boswell: "Why, sir, you find no man at all *intellectual* who is willing to leave London. No, sir, when a man is tired of London, he is tired of life, for

* There are not wanting students, anti-Baconian as well as Baconian, who hold that *Venus and Adonis* was written as early as 1585.

there is in London all that life can afford." Is it conceivable that a man who cared for literature or things of the mind would—except under medical imperative, of which there is no hint—have quitted the intellectual centre of England for the deadly dulness of the Stratford of that day, with its butchers and bakers and publicans, its Quineys, Harts, Walkers, Nashes, Greenes, and the rest? There is no evidence that the "Tribe of Ben," the frequenters of the Mermaid Tavern, or anyone else remonstrated, or made any effort to keep him by the banks of Thames. He seems indeed to have slipped out of London entirely unobserved, just as he had entered it a quarter of a century earlier. Again, when so many notable pens were lamenting the death of Prince Henry, or celebrating the marriage of his sister, what was Shakspeare doing? How came he to be silent? In 1613 he is investing money in London, and in 1614 is interesting himself in an enclosure scheme that was then agitating his native place. In the course of these and many similar transactions he must have had occasion again and again to communicate with lawyers at a distance, to say nothing of friends and relations; yet not one line of his handwriting has yet come to light. His signatures—those which pass for his—betray unfamiliarity with the use of a pen, and suggest indifference as to the spelling of his name.

That he ever cherished any ambition more exalted than that of buying land and passing for a squire; that it ever occurred to him to claim interest in, or power over, such a thing as a manuscript; that he would have been able to appreciate anything in the shape of a library; that he had acquired a liking for poetry or prose, history, philosophy, or science—on all these points we find abundance of conjecture, but a famine of trustworthy evidence. There is reason to

believe that his death was sudden, for his health was "perfect" at the beginning of 1616. His will, our most authentic and inward piece of evidence concerning the man, is rootedly commonplace. His precious plate (with the exception of a "brod silver and gilt bole" left to his daughter Judith) is bequeathed twice over, once to his niece Elizabeth Hall absolutely, and again to "my sonne in lawe John Hall gent, and my daughter Susanna," whom he made his executors. His "second best bed with the furniture" is not forgotten. New Place cannot have been entirely destitute of books, but whatever they were, both he and his lawyer forgot their existence, or lumped them together as so many negligible items of the owner's "goodes chattels and household stuffe." Of literary executors there is no suggestion. A legacy of 26s. 6d. was left to R. Burbage, and John Hemynges and Henry Cundell were to have like sums "to buy them ringes." But of Jonson, Chapman, or any literary name there is no mention. On the 23rd of April, 1616, the worthy man died. When Jonson died the world of letters went into mourning. When Shakspeare died the world of letters seems to have been absolutely unconscious of loss; for not a single note of regret that synchronises with his death has reached our attentive ears. If one cared to put a finishing touch to the story, his intimate London friends, the Burbages, would serve the turn. Some twenty years after his death, and about a dozen after the publication of the First Folio, these Burbages—among them Richard Burbage's widow—presented a humble petition to Philip Earl of Montgomery, survivor of the two Earls to whom the First Folio was dedicated, imploring him not to allow them "to bee trampled upon by new men." In their petition they mention Shakspeare twice, and though it was obviously their cue to praise him, the most they can find to say in his favour is that he was one of "those deserving men, Shakspeare,

Hemings, Condall, Philips and others." Had he been the author of the First Folio, it is incredible that these friends of his in addressing the Earl to whom the volume was dedicated, should have failed to mention the fact. Yet orthodoxy would have us believe that this man was Shakspeare! We are not blind to the difficulties of the Baconian view; indeed, some of us were agnostics before we became Baconians. What we contend is that our theory, unlike the Stratford legend, does not demand a faith which would be able to move mountains.

The historian of Laputa tells of a machine by means of which "the most ignorant person at a reasonable charge and with little bodily labour might write books in philosophy, poetry, laws . . . without the least assistance from genius or study." Is it possible that Swift when he wrote this was thinking of the Shakspeare tradition?

EDWARD W. SMITHSON.

SHAKESPEARE AND ASBIES.

IN a series of articles in the *Athenæum* Mrs. Stopes gives a pathetic account of the passing of the estate of Asbies from the Shakespeare family, and elaborates a theory that "the story of William Shakespeare's lost inheritance is the clue to the shaping of the poet's life." The substance of the articles is taken from the documents which are published in Mr. Halliwell Phillips' "Outlines of the Life of William Shakespeare"; and the writer, who has evidently been industrious in her researches, adds very little of her own apart from inferences which are unconvincing, and in some cases misleading, because she is not sufficiently familiar with the legal technicalities relating to the ancient methods of alienation of land and the old system of chancery proceedings.

There is one document, however, which the writer claims to have discovered, and this triumph of research has led her to write contemptuously of Baconians. It is a list of the names of the "Gentlemen and Freeholders of the County of Warwick" in the State Papers of April, 1580, "which," as Mrs. Stopes says, "none of the Baconians appear to have noted." It is certainly difficult to appreciate the significance of this document, which merely mentions John Shakespeare of Stratford-on-Avon as the owner of the estate of Asbies—a matter about which there has never been any controversy or doubt.

The facts relating to the alienation of Asbies by John Shakespeare, the father of Wm. Shakespeare of Stratford-on-Avon, may be gathered from an impartial examination of the pleadings in the litigation which followed the mortgage of the property in 1578. Unfortunately Mrs. Stopes is not impartial, for she accepts the allegations of John Shakespeare, the plaintiff, and

entirely rejects the other side of the story. She imagines that John Shakespeare was very badly treated in the matter, whereas it is difficult to see how he had any case at all. He commenced several actions against John Lambert, one of which was based upon allegations of fraud and was not proceeded with; another was dismissed with costs by an order in Chancery; and the other was carried as far as taking the evidence of witnesses on commission and was then abandoned by the plaintiff.

The theory of Mrs. Stopes is that these results were possibly due to lack of funds, but a closer examination of the plaintiff's claims and the statements in the defence suggests that the litigation was vexatious and never ought to have been instituted.

The story to be gathered from the pleadings may be briefly told. In 1578 John Shakespeare was in financial difficulties, and to meet his growing liabilities he borrowed money from his wife's relations, giving as security a mortgage on lands which had come to him through his wife. Among other loans he borrowed £40 from his brother-in-law, Edmund Lambert, and gave as security a mortgage on the estate of Asbies. The mortgage deed was a sale of the property, subject to the condition that if the £40 was repaid by Michaelmas, 1580, the sale should be void. The money was not repaid within the stated period, and other formalities—by "deed poll and livery of seisin" and "levying a fine"—were completed by John Shakespeare establishing the title of Edmund Lambert as the owner of the property.

The process of "levying a fine" requires some explanation. An action was brought in the Court of Common Pleas at Westminster by a writ demanding the lands. The defendant in consideration of the purchase money, or admitting a former gift, acknowledged the plaintiff's right to the lands. Terms of compromise

were then drawn up and called "The Concord." The Court official drew up an abstract of the writ and concord, which was called the Note; and from the Note he made the Chirograph of the Fine. Indentures of the Chirograph were made and delivered to the parties, and these were the title deeds or evidence of ownership of the property.

Mrs. Stopes apparently does not realise that John Shakespeare adopted this process of "levying a fine" in respect of the estate of Asbies, and the Lamberts held the Chirograph or title deeds to the property which, on the death of Edmund Lambert in 1587, passed to his son and heir, John Lambert.

These formalities having been completed, it is somewhat surprising to find John Shakespeare, after a period of ten years, embarking upon litigation with respect to the estate of Asbies; and there seems to be some substance in the allegation of the defendant (John Lambert) that the complainants (John Shakespeare and his wife) "do now trouble and molest this defendant with unjust suits in law, thinking thereby, as it should seem, to wring from him some further recompense for the said premises than they had already received."

The litigation began in 1589, when John Shakespeare brought an action in the Court of Queen's Bench against John Lambert, alleging that the defendant had promised to pay him £20 more for the property of Asbies. He also made a charge of fraud and claimed the sum of £30 as damages. In his defence John Lambert denied the promise, and the action was not proceeded with.

It is interesting to quote Mrs. Stopes' article commenting on this action, where she says: "It is logically certain that, however it might be entered in his parents' names and his own, William Shakespeare, as the heir apparent, was a party to the action—probably instructed the attorneys and did all the personal duties of a com-

plainant. And thus, by a peculiar combination of circumstances, the first time William Shakespeare's name was written in London, the first time it was spoken in London, *was in the Law Courts!*"

The enthusiasm, which inspired Mrs. Stopes to italicise these words, is quite unaccountable when one realises that the case was abortive and never came into Court at all.

The next step in litigation is after another interval of nearly ten years; but, apart from the suggestion of a stale claim, it is a recognised practice of the Courts to regard with suspicion any claim against the estate of a deceased person. In 1597 John Shakespeare and his wife started Chancery proceedings against John Lambert to recover the estate of Asbies, alleging that the £40 which had been borrowed on mortgage in 1578 had been tendered to Edmund Lambert (then deceased) in 1580, but that the latter had refused it and demanded the payment of other debts due to him from John Shakespeare before he would re-convey the mortgaged property. This was denied by the defendant; and on the face of it the allegation does not seem credible, having regard to the lapse of seventeen years between the Chancery suit and the time when the tender was alleged to have been made. But, apart from these considerations, there is the fact that the plaintiff carried the case as far as the examination of the witnesses on commission and then abandoned the claim.

Mrs. Stopes tells us that she has diligently sought for the depositions of the witnesses, but without success; and then apparently from want of familiarity with the old system of procedure in Chancery she makes this curious statement:—

"That they (the depositions) had been taken, *and had been in favour of the Shakespeare's*, may be inferred from the entry:

‘John Shakespeare and his wife:—If the defendant shew no cause for stay of publication by this day sennight then publication is granted’ (23rd Oct., Mich., 41 and 42 Eliz. D. and O., and B. 1599).”

The practice in Chancery was for witnesses to be examined before Commissioners, and when their evidence had been taken the depositions were sealed up until the date fixed for “publication.” After publication no witnesses could be examined and the pleadings were closed, unless a special order was obtained. “Publication” meant unsealing the depositions and giving copies of them to the parties, and the entry quoted by Mrs. Stopes was the usual order, which allowed an interval of a week in case the defendant wished to apply to postpone publication. There is nothing in the entry to suggest that the evidence was in favour of the Shakespeares.

The other “indiscretion,” as it is called by Mrs. Stopes, committed by John Shakespeare, was a Chancery suit in his own name alone. The proceedings were based upon the same allegation and brought for the same purpose as the other suit for the recovery of Asbies, in which both he and his wife were complainants. Whether this multiplicity of actions was intended to harass the defendant, or whether it was a mistake of the complainants’ lawyer, as Mrs. Stopes fondly suggests, it is clear that after the plaintiff had taken out several commissions to examine witnesses and had not examined any, it was referred to a Chancery master and was dismissed with costs.

Such is the story of Asbies as shown by the documentary evidence, and, apart from the romance of poverty, there is little cause for sympathy with John Shakespeare in his lost estate. There is certainly no ground for attacking John Lambert, who, according to the statement of John Shakespeare and his wife, was

"a man of great wealth and ability and well friended and allied amongst gentlemen and freeholders of the county of Warwick." In the same pleading the parents of William Shakespeare described themselves in 1598 as "of small wealth and very few friends and alliance in the said county," which ought to be of special interest to the author of "Shakespeare's Warwickshire Contemporaries." In one of her articles in the *Athenæum* Mrs. Stopes even suggests that William Shakespeare was descended from the Beauchamps, and that "Asbies was to the family (Shakespeare) the cherished heirloom, the visible link of connection between their branch and the historic family (Beauchamp) from which they sprang." She does not mention, however, anything more substantial than the belief that a Beauchamp was godmother to an Arden.

Mrs. Stopes is more convincing when she states that "it is perfectly certain that Asbies was intended to be the inheritance of William Shakespeare and that he was prepared to be a small farmer, for which reason he was not trained to any profession or apprenticed to any trade (all 'traditions' on this question are untrustworthy)."

HAROLD HARDY.

THE BOAR-INITIAL.

MANY signs of the assistance and superintendence of Francis Bacon in the production of the innumerable books on various branches of knowledge published during his reign over it have been already pointed out by members of our Society. Let me add another which, even if already noticed, deserves, I think, more particular attention. On page 41 of Sir Edwin Durning-Lawrence's illuminating work "Bacon is Shakespeare" will be seen a plate representing "Bacon's crest from the binding of a presentation copy of the 'Novum Organum,' 1620." This crest is a boar passant, erminois, tusked, and charged with a crescent as a label on the left shoulder. He is moving from right to left. The sign I am about to deal with, although bearing some resemblance, differs in several details. Readers who turn the pages of what may well be described as the instructive volumes which issued from the English Press about Bacon's time will find in many of them prefaces and chapters beginning with a capital letter T, behind the stem of which is a boar trippant, argent, tusked, without a label, and moving from left to right. Now, I suggest that almost anyone acquainted with the acknowledged works and style of Bacon would, on reading the matter following this boar-initial, have reason to suspect that he was either the author or instigator of the preface or chapter thus begun, or that it had some relation to him or his works. So far as my limited research has gone I have found this boar-initial only in volumes printed by Adam Islip, and the literary owners of "eyes more devoutly willing to be blind" will at once catch at this admission and attempt to explain away the significance of the use of this initial by saying that it chanced to be amongst the ornamented type of the printer, who used it haphazard.

Possibly; but the curious fact will remain that he seemed to have no other initial bearing an animal ornament in his founts. Moreover, he certainly had other kinds of initial T's at hand, as appears from the pages of the books to which I will now refer. An article in the *Times* of 3rd December, 1913, on the date of *Hamlet*, gave an account of Gabriel Harvey's copy of the "Chaucer," edited by Speght, and first published in 1598. I have no access to that edition, but have examined the second, which was printed by Adam Islip in 1602. It contains an address to the editor by Francis Beaumont. Speght was of Peterhouse College, Cambridge. Francis Beaumont, the father of the dramatic poet, was also of Peterhouse. He was made a judge of the Common Pleas in 1593. In his address to Speght he writes of those ancient learned men of their time in Cambridge, whose diligence in reading the works of Chaucer themselves and "commending them to others of the younger sort did first bring you and me in love with him: and one of them at that time, and all his life after, was (as you know) one of the rarest men for learning in the whole world." Who was this "one of the younger sort" unnamed by Beaumont? Francis Bacon was at Cambridge in 1573. Now let us turn to the prefatory Life of Chaucer in the volume. The initial letter is a capital T, crossed by a boar trippant. Read the Life, and say whether or not it is in the style of Bacon. Be it his or another's, it is admirable. The same initial and boar is prefixed to other pieces in the same volume, *inter alia* to "*Troilus and Cressida*," which poem may have suggested to "Shakespeare" his play of that title.

In the "General Historie of the Netherlands," by Edward Grimston, a thick folio issued from the same Press, the boar-initial, appears at pages 12, 16, 33, most notably, however, at page 910, where it is followed by a

particular and disparaging account, extending to some 153 pages, of the proceedings of "Robert Dudley, Earle of Leicester, Governor for Elizabeth, Queene of England." We know Bacon's opinion of him. In "The Estates, Empires, and Principalities of the World," translated out of French by Edw. Grimstone, Sargeant-at-Arms, a folio, also printed by Adam Islip for Mathewe Lownes and John Bill, 1615, the boar-initial begins a chapter on "The Commonweale of Venice," and another on "The Estate of the Sophi of Persia." In "The Living Librarie," translated by John Molle from Latin, also printed by Adam Islip, 1621, the boar-initial will be found at chapters 9, 12, 22 of Book III., and chapter 4 and 11 of Book IV. In "The Herbal," by Gerard, printed by Adam Islip, Joice Norton, and Richard Whitakers, 1633, an orderly and exhaustive account of former writers on the subject from the earliest times is in a preface beginning with a boar-initial. This preface is indeed signed Thomas Johnson, the editor of the "Herbal," but whether such a learned treatise on classic authors was really written by him may well be doubted. He was an apothecary in London, and cultivated a physic garden on Snow Hill.

It would be interesting to examine the rest of the books from the same Press for the boar-initial, but I am not in a position to do so. One volume I have from which it is absent, viz., "Politicke, Moral, and Martial Discourses," translated from the French by Arthur Golding and printed by Adam Islip, 1595. It is a quarto, and contains ornamented initials of various sizes. There are at least three capital T's, but they are of a larger size than the boar-initial, and of different pattern, and are without the figure of the animal. I must candidly add that I expected to find it there, for the volume is a collection of excellent essays,

the result of deep learning, research, and thought. The inference may be either that Bacon had nothing to do with it, or that the printer did not have the boar-initial cut so early as 1595; or, lastly, that my suspicions as to its significance are ill-founded.

J. R., of Gray's Inn.

"THE FELICITIES OF QUEEN ELIZABETH."

THERE is considerable obscurity anent this Latin pamphlet, and the circumstances of its publication. Bacon is reputed to have left a Will. Mr. Spedding gives *in extenso* a copy entered upon the register of the Prerogative Court of Canterbury, dated 19th December, 1625. The original Will was delivered out on 30th July, 1627, and is missing. In this copy Will no reference is made to the Elogium forming the title to this article.

According to an extant MS. copy in the hand of one John Locker, an earlier Will was made by Bacon on 10th April, 1621, at the period of his great stress, when his fate was being determined upon by the House of Lords. In this Will, if its accuracy may be relied on, he directed that his body should be buried obscurely (a practice then common to members of the Rosicrucian fraternity), and as to his unpublished compositions, he gave certain directions, and "in particular I wish the Elogium I wrote, 'In felicem memoriam Reginæ Elizabethæ,' may be published." We are in doubt as to the correctness of the registered version of the later Will, as Archbishop Tenison published a transcript out of the Lord Bacon's last Will containing different words. For comparison I place the three Wills or versions in juxtaposition:—

“My compositions unpublished, or the fragments of them, I require my servant Harris to deliver to my brother Constable, to the end that if any of these be fit in his judgment to be published he may accordingly dispose of them. And in particular I wish the Elogium I wrote, ‘In felicem memoriam Reginæ Elizabethæ,’ may be published.”—Locker MS. of Will of 1621.

“But towards that durable part of the memory which consisted in my writings I require my servant Henry Percy to deliver to my brother Constable all my manuscript compositions and the fragments also of such as are not finished; to the end that if any of them be fit to be published he may accordingly dispose of them. And herein I desire him to take the advice of Mr. Selden and Mr. Herbert of the Inner Temple and to publish or suppress what should be thought fit. In particular I wish the elegy which I writ, ‘In felicem memoriam Elizabethæ,’ may be published.”—Tenison Transcript of last Will, 1625.

“Also I desire my executors, especially my brother Constable, and also Mr. Bosville presently after my decease to take into their hands all my papers whatsoever which are either in cabinets, boxes or presses and them to seal up until they may at their leisure peruse them.”—Registered Will, 1625.

There is variation between the three Wills as to another important phrase.

1. “I bequeath ‘my name to the next ages and to foreign nations.’”—Locker MS. of Will of 1621.

2. “For my name and memory I leave it to foreign nations and to mine own countrymen after some time be passed over.”—Tenison Transcript of last Will, 1625.

3. “For my name and memory I leave it to men’s charitable speeches and to foreign nations and to the next ages.”—Registered Will, 1625.

The solution of the problem may be that Bacon left one Will for probate purposes and another for certain private directions which are not yet apparent.

If it be the fact that in 1621, and again later, he particularly wished the Elogium to be published, it will be useful to discuss why his directions were given.

The Queen died on 24th March, 1603. The Elogium appears to have been written in the summer of 1608. About this time Bacon sent a copy of it to Sir George Carew, then ambassador in Paris, with the explanation that it was written by way of reply to a recent book attacking the Queen's memory. The Elogium was written in Latin, and was read by John Chamberlain, who by letter to Dudley Carleton, of 16th December, 1608, recommended him to try to get it. In February following Bacon sent a copy of it to Sir Tobie Mathew, who appears to have suggested in reply that it rather opened the subject to contradiction.

Bacon, in writing again, told his friend that he had heard from the Embassy at Paris and from some others that it carried a manifest impression of truth with it, and was having a convincing effect.

In 1608, therefore, the pamphlet had gone the round of Bacon's friends, but whether printed or not is uncertain. Why did Bacon in 1621, and if the Tenison Manuscript refer to a last Will (which I believe it does), again in 1625 wish the Elogium in particular to be published after his death? We can understand his writing it; he himself gives an explanation. Apart from this he held the strong view that "*Bona Fama propria possessio defunctorum*" ("Advancement of Learning").

Yet there are inconsistent circumstances to be noted. If Bacon was, in 1608, strongly anxious to perpetuate the good fame of Elizabeth why did he in the "*De Augmentis*" of 1623 repeat passages of his "Advancement

of Learning" *with the portions in praise of Elizabeth expressly omitted?* For these passages, see Bacon's "Works," Montague, Vol. III.

According to Chamberlain the Latin of the Elogium was not very clever. Mr. Spedding says: "It cannot have been for its literary merit that Bacon especially valued this writing; for the style is more than usually hasty and careless." He further remarks that Bacon seems to have gone purposely out of his way to bring in the passage alluding to the death of Anne Boleyn. He concludes that he was only making occasion to place on record Anne's last message and his own opinion of her innocence.

The translations of the Elogium made by Mr. Montague and Mr. Spedding respectively differ widely in language but not in general expression.

It will be convenient to here inquire whether the statements in it as to Elizabeth bear the stamp of truth, as Bacon understood it. "No man can be secret except he give himself a little scope of dissimulation" (Essays). "Childless she was, and left no issue." "She desired only a short inscription on her tomb, recording her name, her virginity, and the time of her reign. She allowed herself to be wooed and courted, and even to have love made to her, and liked it, and continued this longer than was decent for her years." There is something to admire in these very things whichever way you take them. *If viewed indulgently* they amount to generous admiration only.

Having regard to the object for which the Elogium was written in 1608, namely, to repel scandalous statements, Bacon does not appear to have moved much further from the real truth than a modern speech for the defence in an unwisely opposed divorce action.

Certain disbelievers in the truth of the biliteral cipher story base their attitude broadly upon the general

unlikelyhood that a man at the solemn time of making his Will would not be entirely truthful. Further, that the man who deliberately wrote the statements in the Elogium directed to be published after his death could not have written the contradictory expressions of the biliteral cipher and word cipher concerning Elizabeth. I admit that his Will of 1625 alluded to Lady Anne Bacon as his mother and Sir Nicholas as his father. Were these statements and those of the Elogium so untrue that Bacon is to be bound by them? I ask, Could he have stated anything else? To the world he was Francis Bacon. Sir Nicholas and his wife were his father and mother until he knew to the contrary at the age of 16. They treated him as their son, and the affection of the foster mother was ever (so the biliteral cipher shows) more certain and true than that of the real mother. It is not uncommon for this state of the affections to arise from long association with foster parents even when known to be such. The Queen desired to be considered a virgin, said the Elogium. So far, then, as the State and her own fame were concerned these statements were not unreasonable to have been put forth at that date.

To her faults it was best for the State and her fame that outsiders should be a little blinded.

But why all this anxiety for the publication of the Elogium?

I think the answer is two-fold. In April, 1621, in the midst of all Bacon's literary preparations, the crash came—a bolt from the blue. Busied with his literary and public activities, with most of his literary aims unfulfilled, his ciphers not made decipherable, his secret history incomplete, and his life probably forfeit, he made his Will and composed his last prayers to the Almighty. "He prepared," to use the biliteral cipher words, "to die and make no sign." The "De

Augmentis” of 1623, with its key to the cipher, was, in 1621, unpublished, perhaps only partly written. He evidently resolved to drop all attempt to make the world acquainted with his true history. The publication of the Elogium was the surrender of his cherished ideals and the return of good for evil to the mother who had sacrificed his claims to her own ends. In April, 1621, Bacon met his troubles half way. Things, however, turned out to this nervous old man better than he had ever expected.

His imprisonment was nominal. The fine, which would have beggared him, was, in September, assigned from the Crown to trustees for his benefit. Being a debt from the Crown it had first claim on his estate, and stood in the way of and protected him from the enforcement of his large liabilities to other creditors. He had his pension of £1,200 a year, and was restored to favour if not to office and the Court.

He again set to work, and completed his writings and ciphers.

By the year 1625 entirely different reasons for publication of the Elogium arose. One may be that it contained passages which by the word cipher had been connected with the mosaic drama of “Anne Boleyn.” The play is outlined in the biliteral story as follows:—

“In the storie of my most unfortunate grandmother, the sweet ladie who saw not the ‘headman’s’ axe when she went forth proudly to her coronation, you shall read of a sadness that touches me nee’re, partlie because of neerenesse of blood, *partlie from a firm beliefe and trust in her innocencie.*

“Therefore every act and scene of the play of which I speake is a tender sacrifice and an incense to her sweet memorie.

“It is a plea to the generations to come for a just judgement upon her life, whilst also giving the world

one of the noblest o' my plays hidden in cipher in many other works."

I accordingly suggest, as a reasonable explanation, that the 1625 document of directions, which Tenison speaks of as a transcript from Bacon's last Will and Testament, was intended to insure the publication of the Elogium, not for its Latin or its literary merits, and not even for its references to Elizabeth, otherwise similar encomiums would not have been omitted from the "De Augmentis," but mainly because it was a document in which Bacon lodged important word cipher material, in which (in the view of Mr. Spedding) he went purposely out of his way to place on record Anne's last message and his own opinion of her innocence. This material was put into English by Rawley many years before 1657.

As for Elizabeth, the words of the Elogium which conclude the essay are significant:—

"The only true commender of this lady is time."

PARKER WOODWARD.

“THE MASTER-MISTRESS” IDENTIFIED.

NO sonnet could be more esoteric than number 20, which has consequently been the subject of much controversy, and many theories as to its interpretation. The lines read :—

“A woman's face, with Nature's own hand painted,
Hast thou, the Master-Mistress of my passion ;
A woman's gentle heart, but not acquainted
With shifting change, as is false women's fashion ;
An eye more bright than theirs, less false in rolling,
Gilding the object whereupon it gazeth ;
A man in hew, all hews in his controlling,
Which steals men's eyes, and women's souls amazeth.”^o

Who is this “Master-Mistress” of the poet's passion ? Malone observed, “It is impossible to read this fulsome panegyric, addressed to a male object, without an equal mixture of disgust and indignation.” Let us see, however, whether the enigma may be interpreted in such a way as to free Shakespeare from reproach. Suppose, for instance, the lines be allegorical ? The meaning of “a man in *hew*, all *hews* in his controlling” has always been inexplicable, and has been altered to appear in

* The remaining lines (9—14) of this Sonnet, I interpret thus :—

“And for a woman [*a piece of tender air*’—*Poesy* ; “*my thought . . . slight air*,” *Sonnet 45*] wert thou first created [*gifted by God*]

Till Nature [*natural philosophy*], as she wrought thee, fell a doting,

And by addition [*of the pursuit of philosophy*] me of thee [*Poesy*] defeated.

By adding one thing [*the name of Philosopher*] to my purpose nothing : [*which I would rather ignore*]

But since she [*Nature*] pricked thee [*Bacon*] out for women's pleasure [*for Poesy's delight*]

Mine be thy love [*let me pursue that*], and thy love's use their treasure [*and my achievements shall surpass all*].

modern additions as "a man in *hue*, all *hues* in his controlling," but this change does not seem to help us over the difficulty, and is quite unwarranted, as we shall see.

The clue as to "Master-Mistress" is to be found in Bacon's "Wisdom of the Ancients" (1609) under the fable of "Dionysus" or (*Passion*), who "when grown up appeared with so effeminate a face that his sex seemed somewhat doubtful." Bacon interprets this as meaning that "every vehement *passion* appears of a doubtful sex, as having the strength of a man at first, but, at last, the impotence of a woman." This is a very quaint notion, but, I believe, of great antiquity, for Apollo (the god of Poetry and Eloquence, and, therefore, *Passion*) was always represented as a tall, beardless youth with long hair. He had, moreover, the power of assuming various shapes (or "*hews*") to gratify his passion in his amours. He thus answers the description of the "Master-Mistress" of this Sonnet, but the complete portrait, and explanation of the Sonnet, is forthcoming from that delightful example of parabolical poetry, "A Lover's Complaint," which was included with the Sonnets in the quarto (1609). In the Poem we find a shepherdess, an effeminate-looking, "maiden-tongued," passionate and eloquent youth, a hill, a river, and a horse. Considered as an allegorical poem, it is impossible not to identify

The Shepherdess	as the Poet
The beautiful Youth	as Apollo
The Hill	as Helicon.
The River	as Hippocrene.
The Horse	as Pegasus.

In the opening stanza, the shepherdess is discovered sitting by a river and,

"Of folded schedules had she many a one,
Which she perused, sighed, tore, and gave the flood."

Is "folded schedules" a cryptic allusion to enigmatical writings, which she was "drowning," as Prospero intended to do with his "book"?

The description of herself agrees in a very remarkable manner with that of the writer of the sonnets.

She begins her "complaint":—

" Though in me you behold
The injury of many a blasting hour,
Let it not tell your judgment I am old ;
Not age, but sorrow, over me hath power."

Compare this sentiment with that expressed in Sonnet 19:—

" Yet, do thy worst, old Time : despite thy wrong,
My love shall, in my verse, ever live young."

Bacon is described by a contemporary as "of a middling stature ; *His countenance was indented with age before he was old.*" Shakespeare represents himself (Sonnet 62) as "Beated and chopp'd with tann'd antiquity" ; see also Sonnet 73, &c.

She fulfils the qualification of *Passion* as "having the strength of a man at first, but at last the impotence of a woman," for against the youth's "subduing tongue" she long held her "city," but yielded to his "art of craft" eventually.

" Ah me ! I fell, and yet do question make
What I should do again for such a sake."

Apollo, being banished from heaven by Jupiter, served nine years as a shepherd at Thessaly ; hence the favourite adoption of a pastoral setting for allegorical poetry. The youth is indeed the god of poetry and eloquence ; there is nothing of the rustic about him :—

" So on the tip of his subduing tongue
All kinds of arguments and question deep
All replication prompt, and reason strong,
For his advantage, still did wake and sleep :

"The Master-Mistress" Identified.

To make the weeper laugh, the laughter weep,
He had the dialect and different skill,
Catching all passions in his craft of will.
That he did in the general bosom reign
Of young and old ; *and sexes both enchanted.*"

Which again reminds us of the Sonnet :—

"Which steals men's eyes, and women's souls amazeth."

All "hews" were, moreover, in his "controlling" :—

"O, that *infected* [*i.e.*, feigned] moisture of his eye
O, that *false* fire which in his cheeks so glow'd,
O, that *forc'd* thunder from his heart did fly,
O, that sad breath his spungy lungs bestow'd,
O, all that *borrow'd motion*, seeming ow'd ! [*i.e.*, his own]."

Shakespeare claims this power for the poet :—

"The poet's eye, in a fine frenzy rolling,
Doth glance from heaven to earth, from earth to heaven,
And, as imagination bodies forth
The *forms* of things unknown, the poet's pen
Turns them to shapes, and gives to airy nothing
A local habitation and a name."

—*Midsummer Night's Dream.*

Mr. E. G. Harman, C.B., in "Edmund Spenser and the Impersonations of Francis Bacon," points out on page 99 that "Spenser" in "The Masque of Cupid" ("Faerie Queene," III. xii. 7) places "Fancy" at the head of the procession of figures :—

"The first was Fancy, like a lovely Boy
Of rare aspect, and beautie without peare,"

and remarks, "The 'grave personage,' who appears before the entry of the Masque, is evidently the poet's idea of himself, outside and *in control of the shapes* which stream from his imaginative faculty."

Another important observation by Mr. Harman concerning "Spenser," which is also a characteristic of the author of "Shakespeare's Sonnets," appears on page 58 of his book :—

“By a division of personality—which is very marked—he includes himself among his pupils, confessing and admonishing himself freely under the guise of character and dialogue. Similarly he treats his genius as something apart from himself, and refers to its performance in language of superlative eulogy.”

Shakespeare does precisely the same in the Sonnets, and because he cannot “with manners” praise that which is part of himself, he in Sonnet 39, makes a separation of his genius:—

“O, how thy worth with manners may I sing,
When thou art all the better part of me? °
What can mine own praise to mine own self bring?
And what is’t but mine own when I praise thee?
Even for this let us divided live,
And our dear love lose name of single one,
That by this separation I may give
That due to thee, which thou deserv’st alone.”

There only appears to be a single reference in the index to the Sonnets in Mr. Harman’s book. It is unfortunate that their allegorical significance has been overlooked, for the Sonnets clinch many of his arguments.

In the Fable of *Orpheus* (Wisdom of the Ancients) we are told that “In sorrow and revenge for his death, the river Helicon (*i.e.*, Hippocrene), sacred to the Muses, hid its waters underground, and rose again in other places.” Bacon’s explanation is that “barbarous times succeeding, the river Helicon dips underground: that letters are buried till things having undergone their due course of changes, learning rises again, and shows its head, though seldom in the same place, but in some other nation.”

° Bacon writes in a similar strain, “How many things are there which a man cannot with any face or comeliness say or do himself? A man can scarce allege his own merits with modesty, much less extol them” (Essay “Of Friendship”).

This undoubtedly explains the action of the Shepherdess "tearing of papers" which she gives to "the flood."

R. L. E.

JAMES SPEDDING.

THIS famous editor of the works of Francis Bacon is repeatedly quoted as a Solon whose decision ought to be final on the question whether Francis wrote the Shakespeare plays. His considered opinion appears to have taken the form of a letter to the Hon. N. W. Holmes in 1867, in which he said:—

"I believe that the author of the plays published in 1623 was a man called William Shakespeare. It was believed by those who had the best means of knowing, and I know nothing which should lead me to doubt it. . . . I doubt whether there are five lines together to be found in Bacon which could be mistaken for Shakespeare, or five lines in Shakespeare which could be mistaken for Bacon, by one who was familiar with the several styles and practised in such observation."

It will be seen that he first rested his decision upon the *authority* of those who had the best means of knowing. The only persons answering this description are Heminge, Condell and Ben Jonson. The testimony of the two former has long since been shown to be untrustworthy.

Jonson's position as an "authority" is irretrievably damaged by his allegation in the Folio that "My Shakespeare," and in his "Discoveries," that Francis Bacon had accomplished in the English tongue that which might be preferred to anything produced by insolent Greece or haughty Rome. Outside miracle, the only tenable inference from Jonson is that Francis Bacon and "My Shakespeare" were *one and the same person*.

Mr. Spedding's other ground of decision was dissimilarity of style, yet he had edited documents and books in which Bacon's style had varied greatly, and in one of which Bacon wrote, "Style is as the subject matter," and in another mentioned poesy as a *style* of writing he was then using.

Passages from Bacon and "Shakespeare" conforming to Mr. Spedding's conditions have been produced by the score, and passages of identity of thought and expression by the hundred. The writings of Mr. Reed, Mr. Wigston, Mrs. Pott, Mr. R. M. Theobald, and many other writers, witness to this.

Mr. Spedding first took in hand the editing of Bacon's philosophical, ethical and educational works, and consequently *steeped his mind with the style of Bacon in his old age when writing serious literature*. This was a fatal education for free judgment upon the point of style.

Mr. Spedding did not attempt to write Bacon's biography, but only accompanied the sorting out of Bacon's letters and smaller papers with a commentary biographical and historical, his *avowed object* being to exemplify through the Bacon documents the *politics and scientific progress of the age* in which Bacon lived. Nor had he the proper qualifications for a biographer. Mr. G. S. Venables, in a preface to "Evenings with a Reviewer," affirmed that in Spedding's intellect and temperament there was no versatility, that his literary predilections were limited to a few authors, and his knowledge of the details of history extended in neither direction beyond the time of Elizabeth and James I.

Moreover, Spedding himself was in the habit of saying that he got undeserved credit for knowledge because no one would believe that such a man was so profoundly ignorant.

Thus steeped in the style employed by Bacon in his

old age in the composition of his philosophical and serious treatises, Spedding next set about ordering all the letters and smaller tractates which had been permitted to survive three hundred years from Bacon's birth. He started with the assumption that Francis was the younger son of Sir Nicholas and Lady Anne Bacon, and notwithstanding inconsistency after inconsistency staring him in the face, plodded along with his task without as much as a query. He passed Rawley's remark—that Francis came back from France with a message for the Queen—as something that might or might not have occurred, and noticed the Hilliard miniature without seeing from the date upon it that Francis must have returned awhile in that year (1578), and that to have had his portrait painted by the Queen's private Court limner was a curious circumstance.

The sturdy objection raised by this young man to being put to the study of law is recorded without illuminating comment. Nor did the letter showing that the Queen had provided a maintenance for this penniless "son of the Lord Keeper," and had appropriated him to her service, disturb the placid serenity of Spedding's mind. He recorded the Prime Minister's several interventions in the affairs of Gray's Inn in order to obtain for Francis special conditions of board and residence without asking why this particular youth was so favoured. He missed the fact of the young man's second travel abroad, and never seems to have come across the remarkable letter to Francis while abroad from Sir Thomas Bodley. He set out F. B.'s "Notes on the State of Christendom," but does not wonder why this penniless youth was employed on such work, nor why he should have had the impertinence at the age of 24 to write a special letter of advice to the Queen. Spedding did not know that Francis was the elder son of the Queen, born under

conditions which rendered open recognition politically impossible. Nor did he appreciate that Francis, with a fine eye to the situation, elected at the age of 31 to pursue a literary career and take all knowledge for his province, trusting that his chance of the throne might eventually prove fruitful. The incidents of 1593 conveyed no hint to Mr. Spedding's mind. He agreed with the political wisdom of F. B.'s conduct over the subsidy vote and admired the bold and dignified way in which Francis maintained to the Queen the correctness of his conduct in the matter. But yet Spedding expressed no surprise that this youth (if of Nicholas Bacon parentage) was not clapped into gaol for his impudence. Nor was he surprised that this youth, without legal experience, should have badgered everybody, including the Queen herself, to let him have one of the most important and remunerative law offices in the gift of the Crown. It did not strike Mr. Spedding as strange that this youth (whom he believed to be son of Sir Nicholas) should show temper at not getting what he wanted, and should threaten to retire to Cambridge or go and live abroad.

Mr. Spedding—good, easy man—believed that during the period 1580—1594 Francis was steadily devoted to the study and practice of the law; yet all the time the letters showed that except three appearances in Court in the early part of 1594, and for which cases for private suitors he had to obtain special permission from the Queen, his legal practice was confined to the Queen's business only, and that after the law offices had been filled he announced his determination *not to follow the law*, as it took up time he could devote to better purposes. But that if the Queen really needed his services at any particular time, of course he would be ready to give them.

It never occurred to Spedding to ascertain, if he could, what were these better purposes, so he could not understand the allusion to the "waters of Par-

nassus" in F. B.'s letter to Essex, or to "concealed poets" in F. B.'s letter to Sir John Davis in 1603. Mr. Spedding cited numerous entries from the "Promus," but only wondered for what purpose they were written. He could read the quotation, "Magnitudo Honeris et Oneris," in Bacon's letter to Burleigh, and, although he thought he knew his "Shakespeare," did not recall the play upon the two words in Wolsey's speech—

"Out of pity taken. A load would sink a navy,
Too much *Honour*. Oh 'tis a *burden*!"

No man recognised more fully than Spedding the nobility of character and intellectual qualities of this great poet, philosopher and prince. No one has fought so bravely and devotedly in his defence. The fine Sonnet which Spedding wrote to Bacon's memory deserves to be better known. It is given in *BACONIANA*, 1905, and its concluding lines are:—

"But when I thought how humbly thou didst walk
On earth—how kiss the merciless rod, I said,
Surely 'twas thy prevailing voice that prayed
For patience with these men, and this rash talk,
Because they knew thy deeds but not thy heart,
And who knows partly can but judge in part."

It is nevertheless time to demonstrate that Spedding was no adept on questions of authorship. The pomp and pageantry of the age of Elizabeth, with its burst of drama and song in the midst of which Francis moved, and to which he largely contributed, was never properly present to Spedding's mental vision. "He saw but in a glass darkly."

Had Mr. Spedding studied the subject in the light of the wealth of new information now at our disposal, his earlier short views, so frequently quoted to obstruct and delay, would have been readily and entirely withdrawn.

PARKER WOODWARD.

DID BACON WRITE "DON QUIXOTE"?

IN a letter appearing in the *Referee* combating criticisms which had been made in the public Press on some of the opinions held by the late Sir Edwin Durning-Lawrence, Mr. John Hutchinson makes the following observations on the suggestion which emanated from Sir Edwin that Francis Bacon was the author of "Don Quixote." The suggestion, Mr. Hutchinson says, "does really seem startling, and one of those things calculated, in the words of the late lamented Mr. Kruger, to 'stagger humanity.'" He goes on to say:—

"But is it, indeed, a self-evident delusion? Frankly, on first hearing of the statement bluntly put like that, I, for one, was inclined to think that my worthy fellow-Baconian was over-leaping the bounds of probability. But I did not, as some ever-right never-thinkers did, give vent to my credulity in loud 'Go-to-Bedlams!' the usual formulæ of dissent on the part of the orthodox; for the apparent 'lunatic' actually gave reasons for the strange faith that was in him, and gave them calmly, and I sat down to study them, and though I will not go so far even yet as to say that I am convinced by them, yet I must admit that they seemed and seem really sound and solid reasons for a 'lunatic' (as a 'Baconian' is, of course).

"I found that what Sir Edwin said in defence of his seemingly strange assertion was this, namely, that Francis Bacon, the great searcher after truth and the foremost champion of it historically, as against romance, wrote this most diverting of satires in *English*, which in its Spanish dress (donned in honour of Spain, as the home of such literature) completely laughed the latter out of existence in the character it had assumed. Was there anything unreasonable, not to say impossible, in all this when you came seriously to think of it, especially when you were informed that the 'dresser-up' of the satire in its Spanish dress was the greatest of literary artist in Spain, Miguel de Cervantes-Saavadra, who, being at the time in trouble and financial difficulties and 'out of a job,' as the saying is, gladly undertook the task, no doubt, for a suitable consideration? Is

there anything, I ask again, so ridiculous in all this as to arouse the roars of laughter with which it was received by those who think that there are really no things in heaven or earth that are not included in their philosophy, especially when the Spanish dresser-up of the satirical figure of the 'Don' distinctly tells us that he is but the 'dresser-up' and not the creator of the said figure, or, to use the exact phraseology of the preface to the Spanish edition of the work, 'the stepfather, not the real father'—meaning the translator, not the author—of the said treatise?

"Then, again, how is it that, when the work became to be known in English, this same declaration was attached to it, or at least to the edition known as Shelton's translation? And why is this 'translation' pronounced to be the best ever issued? Who was Shelton that he should so far surpass all the other translators? History only records of him that he was employed by the Earl of Suffolk (a friend of Bacon) specially to 'do'—that is, if Sir Edwin be right, to 'father'—this work. Beyond this, it does not appear that he ever did anything else. But Sir Edwin tells us, or told us, that Shelton's 'translation' was 'the best,' because it was really the original—the English original—from which the Spanish book, published in Madrid seven years before, was translated by Cervantes, and that there are proofs of this in the volume itself which he himself possessed.

"Now, sir, I appeal to you whether this story of the origin of a great book, however strange—however, at first hearing, incredible—does not hang together, and whether it is not worthy of being examined with critical care and study, instead of being received with thoughtless jeers and laughter? I am one of those who venture to think so, and, without committing myself finally to this or any other speculation of the late 'arch-Baconian,' as he has been called, I am of opinion that it would be better, before sneering or jeering at the conclusions of an evidently sincere man, in the first place to examine them, and then, if need be, refute them. That, however, as far as I know, has never yet been attempted."

JOTTINGS ON LORD BACON.

*(Continued.)*THOMAS MEAUTYS, SECRETARY TO SIR FRANCIS
BACON.

ALL research work in connection with Sir Francis Bacon, Viscount St. Alban, gives Baconians great pleasure, and this has been true as regards the studies necessary to find out the real facts in the history of Thomas Meautys, who acted as secretary to our great philosopher, and who was knighted by Charles I. in 1641. For the last two years steady work has been going on, and the reward is some knowledge as to his doings, his pleasure, and his work, and the finding of letters from Thomas Meautys to various personages, which reveal his warm, generous nature, and also show that he was a man who occupied several very important posts and performed his duties in a manner so satisfactory to his patrons that he attained high position, which he retained to the end.

The results of this research will be embodied in a history called "Life and Letters of Thomas Meautys, Secretary to Sir Francis Bacon." Pending publication, it will be in type manuscript at the command of the Bacon Society. It is important that the life of this man who was so intimate with Bacon should see light, as so many errors have arisen, by reason of the fact that he had a second cousin, also a Thomas Meautys, who was knighted by James I. at Whitehall in 1610. The history of this older man, who is so often confounded with the secretary, is merely that of a soldier who spent many years in the Low Countries and endured privation and poverty in connection with his profession. The cousins remained dear friends always, as is to be seen by their letters. In a misleading article appearing in *BACONIANA* for April, 1914, on page 111 it is stated: "But the letter

was not written by Mr. Thomas Meautys, who had been Bacon's private secretary ; it came from that gentleman's cousin of the same name, who had close upon the date of Bacon's last will, 19th December, 1625, lent Bacon £300, and, as a creditor who was interested in preserving what could be saved of Bacon's estate, had a claim to early information. He was subsequently made a joint administrator."

My research shows this statement to be incorrect, for Bacon does not seem to have had any dealings at any time with Sir Thomas Meautys the soldier in the Low Countries, or with his sister, Lady Jane Cornwallis, who married Sir Nathaniel Bacon, a nephew of Sir Francis Bacon.

On the other hand, Thomas Meautys the secretary looked upon Lady Jane Cornwallis as his very dearest and most intimate lady friend and cousin, and he carried on a constant correspondence with her. In many of his letters he mentions her brother, whom he generally calls "Sir Thomas Meautys," as was the custom of the ceremonious days he lived in.

In an article—"Jottings on Lord Bacon"—in the January (1914) number of *BACONIANA* I set out the letter alluded to by Mr. Parker Woodward. The circumstances connected with it show that the letter was written by Bacon's secretary, and not by the secretary's second cousin, Sir Thomas Meautys.

This latter gentleman, brother to Lady Jane Cornwallis, writes constantly to his sister and tells her his hopes and fears, his work, and the trials which overtook him when in command of his troops while stationed in the Low Countries. He married a daughter of Sir Richard Burnebye, of Warwickshire, and there are letters from this lady extant to her "Deare sister the Lady Bacon at Culford" from "Yr. most affectionate and truely loving sister to be commanded Anna Meautys." When this marriage was about to take

place, the bridegroom found his finances were at low ebb, as he writes, "In regard of my long stay out of the Low Countries, monye is grown short with me at present." He asks his sister Lady Jane for "a helping hand to sett us up," and mentions in the same letter that his sister, Lady Sussex, has promised him £200 a year. This, then, was the man whom Mr. Parker Woodward says lent Bacon £300. A little more research ought to show the fallacy of this statement.

We have no information as to who was by the side of Bacon when he died at Arundel House. Most likely the secretary would be sent for from London, where his duties at Court kept him. What interests us at present is the mention he makes of Lord St. Alban's death in the only letter found up to the present in which he speaks of that death.

It is addressed to Lady Jane Cornwallis in Suffolk in answer to one in which she apparently had been correcting the style in which her cousin Meautys had been addressing her. She is no friend to Lord Bacon, it can plainly be seen, and her rigid ideas must have received a shock on hearing of the great Chancellor's fall from power. We are led to conclude this is the case from the silence Thomas Meautys preserves about Bacon in his numerous letters to Lady Jane. Unfortunately, we have *no letters from Lady Jane* to give us light on the subject.

In this letter Thomas Meautys mentions that Sir Thomas Meautys, *the brother* of Lady Jane, sailed for the Low Countries on the previous day, leaving his wife in the care of his sister, Lady Sussex, and he adds these words in the postscript, "My Lo. St. Albans is dead and buried."

Here is the letter which was written in the month of Bacon's death:—

"MY EVER BEST LADY AND COUSIN,—I am right gladde that I have found out at last, which I understood by yours received, the way and style to make my letters acceptable, which is, I perceave, by being short and making profession of my desire and happiness to contribute anything towards your health and welfare, which I doe as cordially effect now, as then and ever doe the same while I am

T. MEAUTYS.

"Your brother went for the Low Countries yesterday in hope to retourne some six weekes hence. His lady remaynes with my Lady Sussex. My Lo. St. Albans is dead and buried."

The original is in the collections of MS. at Brome and Culford in Suffolk. On the same page 111 of the incorrect article before referred to, it is stated that the ex-secretary and Lady Jane were brother and sister, "the latter marrying for her second husband Nathaniel, son of Sir Nathaniel Becon, and the former marrying later on than 1626 for his second wife Anne, daughter of Sir Nathaniel. Brother and sister, therefore, *both married children of Sir Nathaniel Bacon.*"

In this last sentence confusion is worse confounded. The brother and sister did *not marry* children of Sir Nathaniel Bacon. Lady Jane commenced life as Miss Jane Meautys, daughter of Hercules Meautys and Philippe Cooke; the latter, a daughter of Sir Richard Cooke of Gedea Hall, and therefore a grand-daughter of Sir Anthony Cooke, the Preceptor of King Edward the VIth. She married for her first husband Sir William Cornwallis, and on being left a widow with one son, whose christian name was Frederick, made a second alliance with Nathaniel Bacon, youngest son of Sir Nicholas Bacon, of Redgrave, Suffolk, who was the eldest son of Sir Francis Bacon's father, the Lord Keeper Bacon.

Through the influence of Secretary Meautys Nathaniel Bacon was made a Knight of the Bath at the Coronation of Charles I., and his wife from that day relinquished her former husband's name and became Lady Jane Bacon.

Her brother, Sir Thomas Meautys, married in 1625 a daughter of Sir Richard Burneleye, of Warwickshire, as before mentioned, and lived with his regiment chiefly in the Low Countries both before and after his marriage.

There is no mention of Bacon's Secretary ever being in the Low Countries. There is a letter where he says his cousin, Sir Thomas Meautys, has asked him to be godfather to his son and be present at the christening, but he fears he will be kept in this country by business connected with the late Lord Bacon's affairs. It appears that Lord Bacon left the estate of Gorhambury, as well as Verulam House in the same park, for the use of Thomas Meautys, his kinsman, and it must have been a serious question how to keep the property in good repair, as it was encumbered with such heavy debts and charges. Later on he lived in the mansion and kept it up. His life was always a busy one, for besides his duties as Clerk of the Privy Council, and Clerk of the Writs and Processes of the Star Chamber, he was elected a member of Parliament for the Borough of Cambridge on January 10th, 1621, and was re-elected to successive Parliaments on 12th April, 1625, in 1626, 1628, and 1640. Hard work did not frighten him, so he put himself forward as a candidate for a still more arduous post, as we learn on consulting the Domestic Papers of Charles I. in the Record Office. It will be noticed that he is always alluded to as "*Clerk of the Privy Council*," which at once distinguishes him from his cousin the soldier in the Low Countries, who had been "Sir" Thomas Meautys since 1610, whereas the Clerk of the Council only became a Knight in 1641.

The following extracts are from a document in the Record Office :—

“On March 16th 1635 Suggested grant to Thomas Meautys one of the Clerks of Council of the office of Muster Master General of England, as the said office was formerly granted to Sir William Wade, Lieutenant of the Tower of London deceased.”

And further on—

“Grant to Thomas Meautys of the office of Muster Master General of England, as Will Trumbull deceased lately held the same office, March 26th, 1635.”

It is to be supposed that Thomas Meautys had now a settled income and found himself in a position to persuade the young lady of his heart to marry him. His affections seem to have been entirely settled on the daughter of his beloved friend, cousin and patroness Lady Jane Bacon, named Ann, whose father, Sir Nathaniel Bacon, was a nephew of Lord Bacon, Viscount St. Alban.

An alliance in 1637 with this young heiress enabled Meautys to live at Gorhambury, and do other things upon which he had set his heart—the most important being the erection of a suitable monument in St. Michael's Church, St. Albans, to the memory of the great Sir Francis Bacon, Viscount St. Albans.

The sculptor's name of this famous sitting statue has been lost, but the Latin inscription gives the name of the donor, Thomas Meautys. The following translation is by Chauncey :—

Francis Bacon
Baron of Verulam, Viscount St. Alban
or by more conspicuous titles
of Sciences of Light, of Eloquence the Law
Sat Thus
Who after all Natural Wisdom

and Secrets of Civil Life he had unfolded
 Natures Law fulfilled
 Let Compounds be dissolved
 In the year of our Lord M.DC.XXVI
 of his age LXVI
 of such a Man
 that to the memory might remain
 Thomas Meautys
 Living his Attendant
 Dead his Admirer
 Placed this Monument.

A. C. BUNTEN.

BACON AND VIRGINIA.

In the following work—

“THE HISTORIE OF TRAVAILE INTO VIRGINIA
 BRITANNIA”;

expressing the Cosmographie and Comodities of the
 Country, together with the Manners and
 Customes of the People,

Gathered and observed as well by those who
 went first thither as collected by

WILLIAM STRACHEY, GENT.,

The First Secretary of the Colony.

Now first edited from the original Manuscript in the
 British Museum by R. H. MAJOR, Esq., of the
 British Museum.

[London : Printed for the Hakluyt Society,
 MDCCCXLIX.]

—we found this *Introduction*, which says :—

“The Editor was extremely desirous of commencing

this introduction with a short biographical notice of William Strachey, the author of the following pages; but notwithstanding that he has used his best exertions, he has been unsuccessful in discovering anything more respecting him than such few points as connect him immediately with the subject of the work itself. The place and date of his birth, as well as those of his death, are unknown. That he was a person of importance in Virginia we shall hereafter show."

But what is of deeper importance to us than his being an unknown quantity is that his *Dedication* is

"To the Right Honourable SIR FRANCIS BACON, Knight, Baron of Verulam, Lord High Chancellor of England, and of His Majesties most honorable Privy Counsell."

Here we have a distinct proof of "*Bacon's*" connection with Virginia and its plantations from the beginning:—

"MOST WORTHELY HONOR'D LORD,

Your Lordship ever approving yourself a most noble fautor of the Virginian Plantation, being from the beginning (with other lords and earles) of the principal counsell applyed to propogate and guide yt; and my poore self (bound to your observance, by being one of the Graies-Inn Society) having bene there three yeares thither, imploied in place of secretarie so long there present; and setting downe with all my welmeaning abilities a true narration or historie of the countrie: to whome shoulde I submitt so aptly, and with so much dutye, the most humble present thereof, as to your most worthie and best-judging Lordship? who in all vertuous and religious endeavours have ever bene, as a supream encourager, so an inimitable patterne and perfecter: nor shall my plaine and rude composition any thought discourage my attempt, since howsoever I should feare to appeare therein before so matchles a maister in that

facultie (if any opinionate worth of mine own worke presented me) yet as the great Composer of all things made all good with his owne goodnes, and in our only will to his imitation takes us into his act, so be his goodnes your good Lordship's in this acceptation: for which with all my poore service I shall abide ever

Your best Lordship's most humbly,

WILLIAM STRACHEY."

Strachey informs us *To Bacco* was known in Virginia by the natives as *apooke* (p. 121).

ALICIA A. LEITH.

Obituary.

SIR EDWIN DURNING-LAWRENCE.

No sadder duty can be imposed upon anyone who has been actively associated with the work of the Bacon Society than the penning of an obituary notice of that generous spirit, who for many years past has occupied the position of their President.

Sir Edwin Durning-Lawrence was the last surviving son of the late Mr. William Lawrence, a native of Cornwall, who came to seek his fortune in London in the early part of the last century. Mr. Lawrence was a man of keen judgment and foresight, possessing the necessary courage and resolution to give effect to those important characteristics. He established an important business as builder and contractor, and eventually amassed a considerable fortune, which enabled his sons to take rank amongst the largest holders of real estate in the City of London. He took a warm interest in municipal affairs, and occupied the position of an alderman of the City. Of his five sons, the eldest, Sir William Lawrence, attained the position of Lord Mayor, and afterwards represented the City of London in Parliament. The second son, Sir James Clarke Lawrence, also filled the office of Lord Mayor, and for many years was M.P. for the Borough of Lambeth. The third and fourth sons, Mr. Frederick and Mr. Alfred Lawrence, died whilst comparatively young. The son of the latter, Mr. F. W. Pethick-Lawrence, is now the sole surviving male representative of the family.

The youngest of the five brothers is the subject of this memoir. He had the advantage of a college education, and took his B.A. and LL.B. with honours at the University of London. In 1867 he was admitted as a barrister of the Inner Temple, but the ample fortune which he had inherited enabled him to follow his inclination for a political career. He unsuccessfully contested East Berkshire in 1885, Haggerston in 1886, and Burnley in 1892. It was not until 1895 that he entered Parliament, representing Truro as a Liberal Unionist, which seat he retained until 1906.

In 1874 he married Edith Jane, younger daughter of Mr. John Benjamin Smith, who was successively M.P. for Stirling and for Stockport, and was the first Chairman of the Anti-corn Law League.

Sir Edwin was created a baronet in 1898, when by Royal license he assumed the additional name of Durning, the maiden surname of Lady Durning-Lawrence's mother. His public services were manifold. He sat on the bench as a magistrate for Berkshire. For a short time he served on the Metropolitan Board of Works. He took a warm interest in University College School, where he was educated; also in the management of the Royal Waterloo Hospital, and many other public institutions.

The Lawrence family were attached to the Unitarian faith. Sir Edwin was a trustee of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association, and was closely connected with the various institutions of the denomination, to which he rendered large financial support.

Sir Edwin was a man of exceptional versatility, and was the fortunate possessor of a phenomenal memory. He had, in a measure, taken all knowledge to be his province. It was difficult to name a subject with the history and particulars of which he was not familiar. This gave a great interest to his conversation. He would frequently astonish his hearers by recounting the circumstances of some out-of-the-way scientific investigation or historical incident with a wealth of detail which was remarkable. He was no mean artist, and many of his friends have carried away landscape sketches which he made whilst talking to them. Music, the drama, literature, science, yielded him sources of pleasure, and on these, and many other subjects, instruction could be gathered from his remarks. His earlier publications were "A History of Lighting, from the Earliest Times," and "The Progress of a Century; or, the Age of Iron and Steam."

Few men were more fearless in the expression of their opinions

than was he. Having formed an opinion, he urged it with a vigour which was sometimes resented. Half-heartedness he abhorred. Not only were his public benefactions on a princely scale, but in private life his liberality was unstinted. No cause or case of a deserving character failed to open the strings of his purse. When he recognised the need for support, he did not wait to be solicited. "How much do you want?" he would say.

An incident exemplifying this is related. He once overheard a schoolmaster refer to the difficulty some parents had in paying the school fees, and to some children who ought to be at his particular school, but could not be entered because their parents were too poor. Sir Edwin handed the master a check for £40, saying, "Use that as you like, and when you want more come to me." No man ever realised to a greater extent the blessedness of giving.

But there was one subject which in his later years overshadowed all others. More than twenty years ago he was led to an investigation of the controversy which was raging as to the authorship of the Shakespeare poems and plays. His clearness of perception soon placed him amongst those who were attacking the claims put forth on behalf of the Stratford Shagspere. He recognised the importance of the controversy, and the obligation which fell upon all fair-minded men to help forward the establishment of the truth. His interest in the subject was originally created by the perusal of the first volume of "The Great Cryptogram," by Ignatius Donnelly. As his investigation proceeded he realised that only by the aid of the original editions of the works to be consulted could satisfactory progress be made. This led to the purchase of these books, and gradually his love for them increased. The idea of a complete collection of the literature of the Elizabethan and Jacobean period resulted. And so came about the formation of the library at 13, Carlton House Terrace, which may be truthfully described as unique. Sir Edwin was one of the founders, and a member of the first Committee of the Lambeth Free Libraries, an office which he retained until his death. The head librarian, Mr. Frank J. Burgoyne, had an exceptional acquaintance with the printed books of all periods, and Sir Edwin inspired him with special interest in this literature and obtained his assistance in the purchasing of books. Whenever a duplicate could be obtained of a volume secured for his collection, Sir Edwin gave orders for it

to be purchased and presented it to the Lambeth Reference Library. These gifts were on such a scale that a collection has there been formed of Baconian books which is probably more extensive than is to be found in any other public library.

The collecting of these books has been conducted with consummate judgment. The library includes a copy of the First Folio of the Shakespeare plays, 1623, and those of 1632, 1664, and 1685, of the second edition, 1598, of Bacon's Essays, a splendid copy of Bacon's translation of the psalms, containing an autograph appreciation of Bacon in Latin verse by George Herbert, and other excessively rare volumes too numerous to be enumerated. The collection is priceless in value. It can never be dispersed. Its eventual destination is not settled. The books will eventually be placed in a public library. Sir Edwin was never more in his element than when showing his books to visitors, who came from all ends of the world. He would hand down volume after volume, and point out the wonders of page 53, and of the left-handed dummy prefixed to the Folio; tell the story of the peculiar circumstances under which some of the rarest books and engravings came into his possession. Hour after hour he would pour out information, appealing now and again to Mr. Burgoyne for some date or fact which for the moment had escaped his memory.

In 1910, "Bacon is Shakespeare" (profusely illustrated) was published. In this Sir Edwin gathered together the arguments and evidence which he considered irrefutably established the Baconian authorship of the Shakespeare poems and plays. He presented a copy of the work to every public library in the world. The total circulation exceeds 30,000 copies. This was followed by an illustrated pamphlet of 24 pages, entitled "The Shakespeare Myth." In it the main arguments contained in "Bacon is Shakespeare" are reproduced. Upwards of a million copies of this pamphlet have been printed and issued. But this does not represent the whole of its circulation. It was translated and published in German, and Sir Edwin placed at the disposal of American newspapers the right of re-publication, and supplied blocks for the purpose, so that the total circulation of the subject-matter far exceeds that number. A propagandist effort on such a scale had never before been made. The attention of the public has been directed to the controversy by Sir Edwin's efforts to an extent which has resulted in his obtaining thousands of converts.

These productions brought him a correspondence with enquiries from all parts of the world. All letters received were courteously replied to. There was a time when it was difficult for a Baconian to obtain a hearing in the public press. The late President of the Bacon Society altered this state of affairs. He wrote letter after letter to the papers, and replied to the comments they provoked. During the last two years it is no exaggeration to say that several hundred letters from his pen have been published in the newspapers of this country, and elsewhere.

A note appeared in the last issue of *BACONIANA* reporting the series of lectures which Sir Edwin had delivered during the winter months of 1913—1914. He was an entertaining lecturer. He availed himself of a large number of lantern-slides to make plain his points and enforce his arguments. Less than a week before his death he was delivering his lecture on "Bacon is Shakespeare" to a large audience at Kentish Town. He was concluding with a brilliant rhapsody—

"Bacon ! thou world's wonder !

Deare Sonne of Memorie, great Heire of Fame,

What needst Thou such dull witnesse of thy Name."

At this stage he fainted and fell backwards. Restoratives were administered, and he recovered. On the following Saturday he was well enough to take a walk on Hampstead Heath. He returned home, and shortly retired to bed, from which he never rose, but peacefully passed away in the early hours of the following Tuesday, the 21st day of April, in his 78th year. The interment took place on the following Saturday in the family vault at Kensal Green Cemetery in the presence of representatives from the many public institutions with which he was associated.

To the last his ardent interest in what may be termed his life's work was maintained, and cards had been issued inviting the members of the Bacon Society to attend at his house on the 7th of May to listen to a lecture from him.

The article from his pen which appeared in the April number of *BACONIANA* on "The First Folio" was one of his last contributions to the controversy. As an example of Sir Edwin's thoroughness in everything he undertook, it may be stated that in returning on the 25th of March, the proof of this article corrected, he wrote :—"It was exceedingly well printed, but we *must* make every comma, &c., exactly like our references." On

the 30th he wrote again, pointing out a further slight alteration (the substitution of "the" for "a") which he remembered had escaped correction.

The world is the poorer by the loss of Sir Edwin Durning-Lawrence. Public charities lose one of their most generous supporters. It has been said of him, that he never made an enemy and never lost a friend. The Baconian cause will suffer from the absence of one of its most convinced, energetic, and stalwart adherents, who has for years past, in season and out of season, propagated the truths as to the immortal fame of Francis Bacon. There is none upon whom his mantle can fall. It behoves those of his comrades who are left to brace themselves to continue the conflict with that fearlessness, that disregard of ridicule, scorn, or censure, which were the characteristics of their late President. They may always be encouraged by the certain knowledge that they hold the truth on this great literary problem, and that in the end truth must prevail.

THE Society has also lost two of its other members who were intimately associated with the late Sir Edwin Durning-Lawrence in his Baconian labours.

Mr. Frank J. Burgoyne succumbed to an illness of long standing on the 18th of October last at the age of 56. In the previous year he underwent the critical operation of trepanning. This was for the time successful, and he returned to his duties, but the old trouble re-asserted itself with fatal results.

Mr. Burgoyne commenced training as a librarian at the age of 17 under Mr. Mullins at the Birmingham Reference Library. Subsequently he was sub-librarian at Newcastle-on-Tyne. From there he was appointed librarian at Darlington, and in 1887 he received the position of chief librarian at Lambeth, which position he held to the time of his death. He was a vice-president of the Library Association and a regular contributor to its "Transactions." He was also the author of "Library Construction, Architecture, &c."; joint author of "Books for Village Libraries"; editor of "History of Queen Elizabeth, Amy Robsart, and the Earl of Leicester." He was the transcriber and editor of a very fine facsimile and type transcript of the famous Northumberland Manuscript.

Mr. Burgoyne possessed a thorough knowledge of books, especi-

ally those of the Elizabethan period, in which he probably had no superior, and his services were enlisted by the late Sir Edwin Durning-Lawrence in the collection of his library. His advice was sought and freely given to his brother librarians throughout the country on important questions.

Mr. Burgoyne was a convinced Baconian and was a member of the Council of the Society.

MISS SHAWCROSS, who passed away after a very short illness in July last, was an old member of the Society, and had acted as private secretary to Sir Edwin and Lady Durning-Lawrence for many years. She was well known to her fellow-members and held in high regard by them.

DR. R. M. THEOBALD.

By the death of Dr. R. M. Theobald the Bacon Society loses one of its founders—one of its most enthusiastic and most accomplished members.

The Society was formed at a meeting held at 81, Cornwall Gardens, on the 18th of December, 1885. At this meeting, Dr. Theobald read a paper on "Bacon, as Viewed by his Biographers." He was a member of the first Committee elected. Only two of those who were present on that occasion now survive—Mrs. Pott, and her brother, Mr. Francis Fearon. In the following June, the first number of "The Journal of the Bacon Society" was published, Dr. Theobald acting as Editor. The Journal was published at intervals until 1892, when in the May of that year the title was changed to BACONIANA, under which title it still continues as a quarterly magazine.

Robert Masters Theobald was born in Birmingham on the 28th of November, 1829. At that time his father held a position of trust in a paper warehouse, but in 1833 became connected with the Religious Tract Society, and moved to London. His mother came from the Morell family, who were originally French—refugees from persecution when the Huguenot massacres occurred. At eight years of age young Robert was sent to the City of London School, where he remained about a year. In 1839 he was moved to the boarding school of his uncle, the Rev. Thomas Morell, at Danbury, in Essex. After a stay there of about four years he again became a pupil of the City of London School, of

which Dr. Mortimer was headmaster. In 1846 he competed for a scholarship at the Glasgow University. It was arranged that before proceeding to take up his studies there, he should spend a year at University College, London. He there studied Greek under Professor Henry Malden, and Latin under Professor de Morgan. After passing through a three years' course at Glasgow University, and taking his degree as M.A., he returned to London, and for a short time, theology and the ministry being considered his vocation, he attended lectures at New College, St. John's Wood, for the training of students for the dissenting ministry. There his orthodoxy was impeached, and he was civilly requested to withdraw or accept the alternative of expulsion. He chose the latter, and in 1852 published a pamphlet relating to the "removal" of himself and two fellow students. After this, he commenced studies as a medical student at University College. He there obtained the degree of M.R.C.S. In 1858 he married, and commenced as a general practitioner at Kentish Town. After a year he removed to Cambridge, staying about the same time, then to Kings Lynn, eventually settling at Blackheath. At one time Dr. Theobald acted as physician to St. Saviour's Hospital, Osnaburgh Street, Regent's Park, which was especially devoted to the practice of the Mattei System. His last years were spent at Lee, and it was there, in his 85th year, that he passed away in his sleep. He had been up during the day, and in the afternoon played chess. Retiring to bed about 10 o'clock he fell into a sleep from which he never awoke.

The story of Dr. Theobald's conversion to the Baconian Theory is set out in the first chapter of "Shakespeare Studies in Baconian Light." One day he was visiting a friend, and took up Gerald Massey's book on Shakespeare's Sonnets. Up to this time the idea that William Shakspeare, of Stratford, wrote the plays and poems attributed to him was, to Dr. Theobald, not so much a persuasion as a settled tradition. He asked his friend what his opinion was of Gerald Massey's book. The reply was: "Doubtless the book is good enough in its way, but if you want to get a clear light as to the genesis of Shakespeare's poetry, you should read *this*," and he put into his hands Nathaniel Holmes' book on "The Authorship of Shakespeare." Dr. Theobald thus describes the effect of its perusal upon his mind:—"As soon as the book was in my hand, the persuasion took hold of my mind that this question of the authorship of Shakespeare was one open to

debate, and that Holmes' conclusion was probably right. My conversion was of the most orthodox and instantaneous character, and the belief then adopted has never been disturbed. But although the central truth came suddenly, the reasons and arguments to support it could not thus immediately enter into the mind. That moment was the starting-point of a long course of study. I read all I could get hold of by Bacon, and re-read Shakespeare, and kept the two in perpetual juxtaposition for years, until the persuasion, which came by a flash of perception, ripened into a strong and well-grounded conviction, resting on facts and arguments solid and secure as mathematical demonstration."

At Kentish Town Dr. Theobald became acquainted with William and Mary Howitt, famous as poets and journalists. These were staunch Baconians. Their eldest daughter became the wife of Alaric Alfred Watts, the first Vice-President of the Bacon Society, from whom Dr. Theobald obtained his first knowledge, before referred to, of the Baconian hypothesis.

With an industry and devotion which were most praiseworthy the convert applied himself to an investigation of this fascinating problem. He had the advantage of classical attainments, which were by no means meagre. His pen was that of a ready writer. For nearly half-a-century his great gifts were lavishly used in searching for the truth, and propounding what he believed to be truth. The pages of BACONIANA and its predecessor contain numbers of articles written by him. They are clear, scholarly, and convincing. He was a regular contributor to the Press, as an article writer, reviewer, and correspondent. When Mrs. Pott published "Bacon's Promus," an exceptionally able review of the work from his pen appeared in *The Nonconformist*. As a controversialist he was in his element, always prepared to give and take hard blows. In 1888, before the appearance of Ignatius Donnelly's "The Great Cryptogram," proof sheets were supplied to *The Daily Telegraph*, which gave rise to a very stormy controversy in that journal, in which he took an active part. Subsequently, by the Editor of that paper's permission, a selection of the letters was edited by Dr. Theobald, and published in book form, under the title of "*Delthroning Shakespeare*." When in England, Mr. Donnelly visited him, and stayed for some days at his house. Dr. Theobald's opinion of "The Great Cryptogram" was that the first volume was a very able and convincing state-

ment of the Baconian case as a matter of literary criticism. As to the second volume, dealing with the Cryptogram, he hesitated to speak, as his personal opinion of the author made him think he was as honest as he was gifted, but he affirmed he could find nothing in it but a gigantic imposture. It was either an apocalypse or a fraud. He held similar views as to the works of Dr. Ward Owen and Mrs. Gallup. His most famous encounters were with Judge Willis and Mr. Churton Collins, to and from each of whom he meted out and received heavy punishment.

Dr. Theobald wrote many pamphlets upon the subject, but his most important work was "*Shakespeare Studies in Baconian Light*." It is a volume in which the fulness of his knowledge of the Shakespeare plays and sonnets and of Bacon's works is made manifest. Notwithstanding the criticisms of Judge Willis in "*The Baconian Mint Examined*," Mr. Crawford in "*Collectanea*," and Mr. J. M. Robertson in "*The Baconian Heresy*," it remains a masterly examination of the marvellous poetry and prose which, under different names, were written by one man. Some time ago he handed to the writer of this notice an interleaved copy of "*Shakespeare Studies in Baconian Light*," with copious manuscript additions and notes, with a request that if a second edition were called for he would see it through the press.

Dr. Theobald kept up correspondence with nearly every Baconian of note at home and abroad, and many eminent Shakespearean scholars. Especially cordial were his relations with the late Professor Dowden, whom he always insisted on describing as at heart a Baconian. In 1912 he published "*Passages from the Autobiography of a Shakespeare Student*." In it he relates, in a gossiping manner, his connection with the notable characters, and their name was legion, with whom he came in contact during his long and eventful life, and expresses his opinions on many subjects outside his favourite study.

Until the last few years of his life music was one of his chief relaxations. He had a good knowledge of its theory, and was familiar with all the great masterpieces. On the piano he was a capable performer. In his declining years solving chess problems became his favourite amusement. He always retained his interest in theological works and had a complete collection of Dr. James Martineau's works. One or other of Martineau's works was constantly in his hand.

But in the fulness of years, surrounded and cared for by his

loving wife and family, honoured by a wide circle of friends attached to him by ties of affection, he has passed away. He was a man of keen intellect and sound judgment, industrious and painstaking in all he undertook. He was amiable in character, and generous almost to a fault. His memory will always be held in high regard by those who had the privilege of his friendship or of his acquaintance.

(FROM GERMANY).

It was a cruel blow when on 21st and 23rd of April last two of the foremost champions of Shakespeare-lore, *Sir Edwin Durning-Lawrence* and *R. M. Theobald, M.A.*, were removed from the battlefield.

The latter, "a hero of the true seed of honour," has become, by his ardour, the foundation-stone of Shakespeare-Society. This great enterprise was, as everybody knows, inaugurated at No. 21, Cornwall-Gardens, on the 18th of December, 1885, when Theobald, then in full manhood, being 55 years of age, delivered the first remarkable speech on "Bacon as Viewed by his Biographers." Up to his last contribution, "Adam Cupid," in *BACONIANA*, 1913, he ever remained one of the most active "Baconians." His standard work, "Studies in Baconian Light," of which he left an interleaved copy with additional hand-notes to the University-Library of Heidelberg, is sure to retain its sterling merit in the vexed Shakespeare-Controversy. It is sincerely to be regretted that this spirited book is but little known, as yet, and consequently hardly appreciated in Germany.

Quite the contrary is the case with *Sir Edwin's* book, "Bacon Is Shakespeare," which stole into our hearts by its alluring title, and which has become a household book in every great library even on this side of the Channel. It has become, as it were, the Symbol of the new Creed. Sir Edwin spared no pains and no expense to propagate his tenet all over the globe. A German translation of his well-known "broadsheet" was circulated at his expense, in 200,000 copies in this country, in Austria and Switzerland, three years ago.

Many criticisms on the book of Durning-Lawrence have appeared in Germany quite recently, in February, in one of the most popular periodicals in this country, the "Thurmer." Dr.

Gustave von Buchwald backed him up, in a spirited article, in opposition to the body of German professors who would appear to have resolved to decline all controversy, in the hope of silencing the Baconians.

Sir Edwin's book has, in fact, become a corner-stone of Bacon studies over here on the Continent. The big word "honorificabilitudinitatibus" has turned out a war-cry, by which party spirit and a lively interest for the Bacon-controversy has been awakened anew, in the Fatherland, after Edwin Bormann's time.

Yet I am sorry to state that things do not look promising or hopeful with us. We are still far from the goal. A true Bacon-biography has still to be written. Spedding, in his "Life of Bacon," was unfavourably influenced by his discovery of "Comentarius Solutus" in St. Martin's-in-the-Fields (as early as 1848) and by the arrival of Miss Delia Bacon in London soon after (1853). Since then he was, along with Carlyle, "blind to truth."

An unbiased biographer of Lord Verulam will have exactly to interpret: (1) The true meaning of "Vivitur ingenio" in Meres' "Palladis Tamia" (1598). (2) *Ben Jonson's* "Discoveries" (1635—36), which in fact represents a richly ornamented frame in which, from behind a thin veil, shines forth the colossal, the true image of Dominus Verulamius as Shakespeare-Nostras. (3) The flagrant artifices and intrigues of English Orthodoxy by which, since the Cabal Cabinet, the "glorious Argosy of the Plays, with portly sail," was purposely dwarfed and with diminutive "Shakspr" canvas set on the ocean of Time.

As reviewed from our retrospective scrutiny, this pious fraud appears to have been hatched on the sly, and heinously conducted and successively managed by Dryden, Rowe, and Pope. *John Dryden*, for one, had a false, idolatrous image (the Chandos portrait) made of an imaginary "genius" (1690—94). After this "image" had become a customary and familiar idol, *Rowe*, on this fantastical foundation, fabricated his fantastical biography (1709). Subsequently (1725—1747) the chief fraud was deliberately perpetrated by Alexander Pope, the calumniator of Bacon. It was Thersiter Pope who had the scandalous and provoking "Stratford Monument" (with the cushion) altered, nay, transformed and altogether changed into the *new* (!) Stratford monument "with pen (!) and manuscript." At about the same time (1740—41) this same "Shaks" was, on behalf of the State, recognised as "Great Shakespeare" in Westminster Abbey,

which is a stigma in English history that can only be rectified by an overt, manifest revocation.

If you add to these "solemn frauds" the falsifications of the Ireland forgeries believed as late as 1820, and the fabrications of "dishonest Payne Collier" (1835-49), then the case is made clear, the problem solved.

Unhappily, our two champions, the representatives of earnest Bacon-Studies, have been taken from our midst before such a peaceful solution had matured. Their memory, at all events, shall live in our hearts; they shall for ever stand high on the pedestal of honour when the chaff of senseless "Shakspr-myth" shall go rot and decay in the ruin of the times.

Heidelberg, May, 1914.

HOFRAS G. HOLZER.

REVIEW.

Edmund Spenser and the Impersonations of Francis Bacon. By Edward George Harman, C.B. London: Constable and Company, Limited, 1914; 8vo royal, 608 pages, 16s. net.

MR. HARMAN has produced a remarkable book. It exhibits the result of many years' study of some of the most notable examples of Elizabethan literature. The conclusions at which the author arrives are, to a great extent, novel. These conclusions are set out in no dogmatic manner, but are for the most part stated in modest terms as his opinions. The evidence relied on is internal rather than historical. The work is suggestive rather than convincing. That Francis Bacon was the author of the poems which were printed under the name of Edmund Spenser has been held by many Baconian students for years past. In "Tudor Problems" Mr. Parker Woodward has given weighty reasons for this belief. To a considerable extent, Mr. Harman travels over the same ground as did Mr. Woodward, but he has dealt with the subject more exhaustively.

In chapters on "The Shepheard's Callender," "The Faerie Queene," Spenser's "Minor Poems," Spenser's "Juvenile Poems," and Spenser's "View of the Present State of Ireland," a vast amount of new information is produced. The works under consideration are examined and commented upon at length, and the similarity in style and parallels in thought and expression between these works and Bacon's avowed writings are pointed out with singular perspicuity and telling force.

Mr. Harman makes the bold statement that the translations of some of the verses of Du Bellay and Petrarch, which appeared in Van der Noodt's "Theatre of Worldlings" in 1569 must be attributed to young Bacon when about eight or nine years of age. He

says: "I see nothing beyond the bounds of reason in the supposition that a boy of seven or eight, who was endowed with the genius which produced the 'Faerie Queene,' should have been able to write passable verses, especially where the material was supplied, and only called for translation. Then, as now, French was no doubt an early subject in the education of children of the well-to-do, and with good instruction it involves no great effort to acquire a fair command of that language in childhood. Moreover, all experience shows that great genius is precocious and begins production before, not after, other men. Pope, Congreve, Chatterton—in music, Handel and Mozart—and many other instances can be cited in support of this." Mr. Harman might have strengthened the probability of his contention by other examples. Agrippa D'Aubigne is a remarkable example of early proficiency in languages. At six years old he read Latin, Greek and Hebrew, and at ten he translated the "Crito." At eleven years of age Philip Melancthon produced a humorous comedy in Greek, which was publicly performed, and whilst in his twelfth year he composed his "Rudiments of the Greek Language," which was afterwards published. Macaulay described Bacon as possessing the most exquisitely constructed intellect which was ever bestowed on any of the children of men. In view of these examples of precocity, there is no improbability in young Francis translating "The Visions of Petrarch" from Clément Marot, or "The Visions of Bellay" at nine years of age.

In a chapter on "Spenser's Life" it is pointed out that his biographers have mainly relied on inferences drawn from the poems, and that where the external sources of information present difficulties they are discarded in favour of what is taken for internal evidence. Couthope's statement, cited by Grosart in his *Life of Spenser*, is quoted: "No poet ever kept a mask over his own features so long and so closely as Spenser."

Mr. Harman gives the supposed year of the poet's birth as 1552, but makes no mention of the fact that in the 1679 Folio of his works it is stated that he was born in London in 1510, and that prefixed to that edition is an engraving of his tomb bearing an inscription to the same effect. It was in 1778, when the tomb was restored, that the latter date of birth was substituted.

Mr. Harman's examination of the historical facts which are known of the life of that Edmund Spenser, who, in August, 1580, was appointed Secretary to Lord Grey de Wilton in Ireland, makes the belief impossible that he was the author of the poems bearing a similar name. The invented visits to London are shown to be improbable, if not impossible. The name was chosen to appear on the title-pages on account of the obscurity of the man and the inaccessibility of his habitation.

The various literary productions bearing the name of Sir Philip Sidney are next considered. Mr. Harman writes: "And here, perhaps, I had better make my confession at once that I

do not believe Sidney wrote a line of the principal works which are attributed to him" ("The Arcadia," "Astrophel and Stella," and "The Apologie for Poetrie"). And again: "That Sidney was not by inclination or practice a writer seems to me evident from the style of his letters."

The authorship of Leicester's "Commonwealth" is attributed to Bacon, and not for the first time. It appeared in 1584 under another title and was known as "Father Parson's Green Coat," from the green-edged leaves. It is said: "The book is a 'philippic' in which every resource of rhetoric is employed (probably in emulation of ancient models in style) with the object of rendering Leicester odious to the people and incensing the Queen against him. His execution even is advocated as the only means of saving the country from ruin and a renewal of the wars of succession." Mr. Harman considers that, although Bacon was frequently employed by Burghley in the underground business of Government, in writing this philippic he acted independently. "It was a desperate bid for employment when other means had so far failed; for a man who could wield such a pen would be worth securing, or at least disarming. . . . One thing is quite certain—that no one could have written this book who was not a lawyer, and also, as Sydney said, intimate with the life of the Court. He must also have had an exceptional memory and imagination and been a practised writer. There is no one except Bacon known to history in that time who combined these qualifications." In attributing the authorship to Bacon, Mr. Harman is probably right. There are in the pamphlet numerous tricks in expression which are peculiar to him. On page 62 of the 1641 edition will be found the words, "Only this I will say," a favourite phrase of his. But when its production is described as "a desperate bid for employment when other means had so far failed," the truth of the criticism may be questioned. From 1580 to 1592, Bacon was financially supported by Burghley in some great scheme in which he was engaged. He describes his uncle as "the second founder of my poor estate," and goes on to threaten a retirement from all Court and other work "if your Lordship (addressing Burghley) will not carry me on." His pen and the intelligence department controlled by him and his brother Anthony were during that period at Burghley's disposal. He could have as much employment as he wanted, but his thoughts and actions were devoted to other objects than official drudgery.

Mr. Harman opens entirely new ground when he associates Bacon with the authorship of some of the works bearing the name of George Gascoigne, with Robert Laneham's Letter and with Lodowick Bryskett's "Discourse of Civill Life." It has already been suggested that some of the literary work credited to Sir Walter Raleigh emanated from Bacon, but the evidence for this view has never been worked out in such a thorough manner as on the present occasion.

It is very natural to suppose that young Francis Bacon would

be present on the occasion of the Kenilworth festivities in honour of Queen Elizabeth. The account of the proceedings have come down to posterity in a small book published under date 25th March, 1576, as "The Princelye Pleasures at the Courts of Kenilworth." The title-page bore Gascoigne's literary motto, "*Tam Marti quam Mercurio*," but no author's name. It was included in a complete edition of his works published after his death.

Previously there had appeared a letter dated 20th August, 1575, addressed from the Court at the city of Worcester by one Robert Laneham to his friend Master Humphrey Martin, both of whom are described as mercers. In this letter an eye-witness gives a full report of the various functions and events which happened during the Queen's visit to Kenilworth. Both these accounts, in Mr. Harman's opinion, were written by the youthful Bacon.

Such, in brief, is an outline of the scope of Mr. Harman's book. It will repay reading and re-reading, and the student who will follow out the channels of enquiry suggested by it will learn much which, without its aid, he might never reach. There is a chapter headed "A Page in Bacon's Life" which is less satisfactory than those chapters which deal with literary matters. Nowhere does Mr. Harman convey to the reader any clear impression of the wonderful personality to whom he is attributing such phenomenal powers in early life. But the suggestions thrown out as to the work accomplished by the lad increases the fascination of the subject. A contemporary biographer says, "At twelve in industry he was above the capacity and in mind about the range of his contemporaries. . . . He was then the observation of wise men, as he became after the wonder of all." Mr. Harman helps his readers in some degree to appreciate what a wonder Francis Bacon was.

CORRESPONDENCE.

A Significant Coincidence.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR,—The "Tragedy of the death of Edward the Second" purports to be written by Christopher Marlowe.

It is a small quarto, and the copy to which I refer belongs to Mrs. Andrew Fiske, of Boston, and bears a running title upon its unnumbered pages of "The Tragedy of Edward the Second." In turning the pages, I was surprised to find one, and one only, bearing the running title "of Edward the Third." My first impression was of a misprint, but then realizing that there were no numerals, and that the word "third" was printed in full, I saw that the change was intentional, and I recognized the possible

touch of the hand of Francis Bacon. I sought at once in the text for some reason for so marked a signal, and the first line of the printed page revealed it. Below the running title "of Edward Third" were the words, "My Lord, ye shall be Chancelour of the Realme." This I find to be a significant coincidence. The following is a copy of the title page:—

THE
TROUBLESOME
RAIGNE AND LAMEN-
table death of Edvvard The
Second, King of England :
With
The Tragicall fall of proud
Mortimer.

And also the life and death of Piers Gaveston, the great Earl of
Cornewall and mighty Favorite of King Edward the Second.

As it was publikey Acted by the late Queenes' Maiesties
Servants at the Red Bull in S. Iohns Streete.

Written by Christopher Marlowe Gent.

LONDON,

Printed for Henry Bell and are to be sold at his shop, at the
Lame-Hospitall Gate, neere Smithfield, 1622.

Boston, April 25, 1913.

LUCY DERBY FULLER.

Other Times Other Manners.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR,—In the *Daily Chronicle* of 19th May, 1914, Mr. J. M. Robertson, M.P., said of Mr. Rudyard Kipling that he "presented one of the most repulsive spectacles in history—the spectacle of real literary power and gifts applied to the mere stimulus and impulse of maligning a large mass of people."

"Mr. Kipling had shown that advancing years had left him more a vessel of wrath than he had ever been. At this critical period Mr. Kipling could bring no counsel and no better ingredients to the trouble than a double dose of that original sin of his—hatred and malice to all men with whom he did not see eye to eye." "Mr. Kipling," proceeded Mr. Robertson, "*had done nothing to solve the problem of which fairly malignant Conservatives had come to see that it was incumbent to speak with moderation.*"

Mr. Robertson has evidently not exhausted the vituperative powers so extensively displayed in his book, "The Baconian Heresy," wherein he reviles and defames the numerous holders of a carefully reasoned opinion that the true author of the Shakespeare plays was Francis Bacon.

If Mr. Robertson will make the experiment of substituting

"Shaksperians" for "Conservatives" and "Robertson" for "Kipling" in his above quoted trenchant sentences, they will serve to describe what many Baconians think of his own interesting personality.

O. Y. Z.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR,—A "Lover of Facts" makes the unkind imputation that I do not love them. It is true I have a tendency to dissemble my love until a "fact" has been well tested and tried, but that, if a fault, is of the very essence of research in the underground passages of Francis Bacon's affairs.

Perhaps a "Lover of Facts" will tell me how it is established that of two persons bearing the name of Thomas Meautys the one who addressed a letter to Lady Jane Bacon was Bacon's former Secretary? Knowing the strong affection Bacon and this late Secretary had for each other, the terms of the announcement of the death are so unemotional as to justify an honest doubt as to whether the late Secretary was the writer of the letter.

She might also tell me how she obtains the fact that the late Secretary was Bacon's heir. He was not a blood relation. "Lover of Facts" should also give authority for her statements about the Arundel letter. The internal evidence does not make it clear whether Bacon wrote it or only dictated it, or whether such a letter was ever despatched, and certainly there is no proof that the writer from dictation was his Secretary.

"Lover of Facts" handles facts very carelessly. I have nowhere stated that Bacon pretended to die in order to know in what estimation he was held by men of letters. His affairs were not entangled or involved in April, 1626, nor were his trustees left to the mercy of the clamouring creditors. There was not twenty shillings in the £, but Bacon ordered his affairs so that they could be properly wound up and his whole estate distributed.

Bacon's Manor of Gorhambury is said to have been vested by him in trustees and was eventually conveyed to Sir Thomas Meautys, who after 1626 married Anne, surviving daughter of Sir Nathaniel Bacon (son of the Lord Keeper's eldest son, Sir Nicholas Bacon). Another account is that Anne married Sir Thomas Meautys, her cousin-german. As one Meautys (mentioned by Mrs. Bunten) was her uncle, and the other not her cousin-german, but only cousin to her mother, there is still the point to be cleared as to whom she really was married. Perhaps it was to a son of her mother's brother, also bearing the name of Thomas Meautys. Neither Spedding nor Montagu help to clear up these confusions. They both confound the two Nathaniel Bacons. One curious fact remains, for which we are much indebted to Mrs. Bunten, namely, that in the month that Francis Bacon is said to have died, a Thomas Meautys, relative of Nathaniel Bacon's wife, proceeded upon a six weeks' visit to the continent!

Will "Lover of Facts" give her (or his) name next time? Contributions to BACONIANA of this kind should not be anonymous.

PARKER WOODWARD.